

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

6 MARIN ALLIANCE FOR MEDICAL
7 MARIJUANA, a not-for-profit association;
8 JOHN D'AMATO, an individual, MED
9 THRIVE, INC. a not-for-profit cooperative
corporation doing business as MedThrive
Cooperative; THE JANE PLOTITSA
10 SHELTER TRUST, a revocable living trust;
and THE FELM TRUST, an irrevocable
living trust; THE DIVINITY TREE
PATIENTS' WELLNESS COOPERATIVE,
11 INC., a non profit cooperative corporation,

12 | Plaintiffs,

13 | VS.

14 ERIC HOLDER, Attorney General of the
United States; MICHELLE LEONHART,
15 Administrator of the Drug Enforcement
Administration; HON. MELINDA HAAG,
16 U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of
California.

Defendants.

Case No: C 11-5349 SBA

ORDER RE PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

On November 4, 2011, Plaintiffs filed the instant action and motion for temporary restraining order (“TRO”) and preliminary injunction seeking to prevent the federal government from arresting, prosecuting, or otherwise seeking sanctions or forfeitures against medical marijuana growers and providers who operate under the auspices of California law. Dkt. 1, 5.

At the direction of the Court, the parties met and conferred regarding a briefing schedule on Plaintiff's motion. By letter dated November 10, 2011, Plaintiffs state that the parties agreed that Defendants would file their response to the TRO motion only by no later than November 15, 2011, and that once the TRO is resolved, the parties will meet and

1 confer regarding a briefing schedule on Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction. Dkt.
 2 20. On November 11, 2011, Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and amended motion for
 3 TRO and preliminary injunction. Dkt. 21, 23. Defendants filed their opposition to
 4 Plaintiffs' amended motion for TRO on November 15, 2011. Dkt. 31.

5 Given the exigent circumstances alleged by Plaintiffs, the Court deems the motion
 6 for TRO fully briefed.¹ In addition, given the briefs submitted, a reply brief is unnecessary
 7 for the Court to render an informed decision on the TRO request. As such, the parties may
 8 not submit any additional memoranda or other filings in connection with Plaintiff's motion
 9 for TRO. Any papers filed in contravention of this Order will be stricken by the Court.
 10 Pursuant to the Civil Local Rule 7-1(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 78(b), the
 11 Court may resolve the motion without a hearing.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: November 16, 2011


 14 SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
 15 United States District Judge

24 ¹ The Court notes that Plaintiffs have had ample opportunity to brief the salient
 25 issues. Both Plaintiffs' original and amended TRO motions are thirty-one pages in length,
 26 which well exceeds the twenty-five page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), and the
 27 fifteen page limit set forth in this Court's Standing Orders. See Dkt. 15 at 5. Plaintiffs
 28 neither sought nor obtained prior leave of Court to file oversized briefs. Although the
 Court would be well within its discretion to strike Plaintiffs' non-compliant briefs, the
 Court declines to do so at this time. However, Plaintiffs are warned that further
 transgressions of the Court's Local Rules and/or Standing Order may result in the
 imposition of sanctions.